



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

LOVE FOR THE DEAD.

The grave is the ordeal of true affection. It is there that the Divine passion of the soul manifests its superiority to the instinctive impulse of mere animal attachment. The latter must be continually refreshed, and kept alive by the presence of its object; but the love that is seated in the soul can live in long remembrance. The mere inclinations of men languish and decline with the charms which excited them, and turn with disgust from the dismal precincts of the tomb; but it is thence that truly spiritual affection rises purified from every sensual desire, and returns, like a holy flame, to illumine and sanctify the heart of the survivor. The sorrow for the dead is the only sorrow from which we refuse to be divorced. Every other wound we seek to heal—every other affliction to forget; but this wound we consider as a duty to keep open—this affliction we cherish and brood over in solitude. Who can look down upon the grave even of his enemy, and not feel a compunctious throb that we should ever have warred with the poor handful of earth that lies mouldering before him?

Ay, go to the grave of buried love, and there meditate—there settle the account with thy conscience for every past endearment, unregarded, of that departed being who can never more return to be soothed by thy contrition. If thou art a child, and hast ever added a sorrow to the soul, or a furrow to the silvered brow of an affectionate parent; if thou art a husband, and hast ever caused the fond bosom that ventured its happiness in thy arms to doubt one moment of thy kindness or thy truth; if thou art a friend, and hast ever wronged, in thought, word, or deed, the spirit that generously confided in thee; if thou art a lover, and hast ever given one unmerited pang to that true heart which now lies cold and still beneath thy feet—then, be sure that every unkind look, every ungracious word, every ungentle action, will come thronging back upon thy memory and knocking dolefully at thy soul—then be sure that thou wilt lie down sorrowing and repentant on the grave, and utter the unheard groan, and pour the unavailing tear—more deep, more bitter, because unheard and unavailing.

Then weave thy chaplets of flowers, and strew the beauties of nature about the grave—console thy broken spirit, if thou canst, with these tender, yet futile, tributes of regret; but take warning by the bitterness of this thy contrite affliction over the dead, and henceforth be more faithful and affectionate in the discharge of thy duties to the living.—*Washington Irving.*

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. II.

WELL, a few days after Jemmy Brannin made up his mind to speak to the Rev. Mr. Owens, it happened that Jemmy and Pat Dolan were working together for a farmer; and they were filling a cart out of some manure-heaps that lay on the roadside. And, as they were working, who should come up the road but Mr. Owens himself. Now, Mr. Owens seldom passed people by without saying a word; for he was a pleasant spoken man, and Irishmen like a gentleman that speaks free and pleasant. So Mr. Owens said, "It is a fine day for the work, boys; thanks be to God for it."

"A fine day, your reverence, God be praised," said Jem, very well pleased to have Mr. Owens to speak to that day.

"It would be bad farming without the dung, boys," said Mr. Owens.

"Sure enough, your reverence, that would be bad work," said Pat; "but there's a deal of poor creatures has little dung to put on it since potatoes went."

"And without the spade or the plough the dung is not much good," said the parson.

"I'm thinking both spade and plough will have to go deeper these times," said Jem.

"Did you ever hear of Jesus Christ digging and dunging?" said Mr. Owens.

"No, your reverence," said both the men, dropping their spades in great amazement.

"Why, did you never read of that in the Bible?" said Mr. Owens.

"No, your reverence," said Jem, "I never did."

"What Bible is it in, your reverence?" said Pat; "is it in the Protestant Bible or the Catholic Bible?"

"And which of these do you read?" said Mr. Owens. Pat did not like to say he never read a word of either in his life, so he said nothing, and Mr. Owens went on—"I believe it is just the same in both, as I could show you if I had the books."

"Well, your reverence," said Jem, "that is just what I would like to see."

"What?" said Mr. Owens.

"The differ between the two books," said Jem.

"Well, if that is all you want to see," said Mr. Owens, "it is not much; for the 'differ' is so small you will hardly see it at all: but what makes you wish for it?"

So Jem was fairly in for the very thing he wanted; and so he said, "Your reverence, I can't make out why reading the Bible should put people astray, and make them leave the Catholic Church."

"Nor I neither," said Mr. Owens. "How could it do

that? It comes to us from God himself, that made the Church, and knows what is best for it."

"But sure, your reverence," says Pat, "don't we know that they that gives us the Bible always wants us to leave the Catholic Church?"

"Were the blessed Apostles good Catholics—St. Peter, and St. Paul, and St. Matthew, and all the rest of them?" said Mr. Owens.

"Surely they were, your reverence," said Jem.

"And how would their writings, that they wrote to all the people that they made Catholics, how would those writings turn any man away from the Catholic Church?" said Mr. Owens.

"That's just what I want to know, your reverence," said Jem; "and I heard tell that it was the Protestant Bible that did it, and that the Catholic Bible would not do it at all; and that's the reason I wanted to see the differ."

"I can't show you the 'differ' without the books," said Mr. Owens; "but if you and your neighbour here will come down to my house some evening, I'll put one book in your hand and the other in his, and you can read turn about, and compare them, and see the 'differ.'"

"And when will we come down, your reverence?" said Jem.

"This evening, if you like, when you leave off work," said Mr. Owens.

"With God's blessing, then, I'll go," said Jem.

So Mr. Owens had to leave them, for he had to see a sick man; and when he was gone, Jem asked Pat to go with him that evening; and Pat was not willing at first; so Jem said to him, "Sure you shall hold the Catholic Bible yourself, and you may as well come and see the end of it."

So that evening they both went up to Mr. Owens's, and he brought them both into his study, and got down the two books; and first he opened the Douay Bible, and showed them what was printed in the first page—

APPROBATION.

"This new edition of the English version of the Bible, printed with our permission, by Richard Coyne, 4, Capel-street, carefully collated by our direction with the Clementine Vulgate; likewise, with the Douay version of the Old Testament of 1509,* and with the Rhemish version of the New Testament of 1582, and with other approved English versions, we, by our authority, approve, and we declare that the same may be used with great spiritual profit by the faithful; provided it be read with due reverence, and the proper dispositions. Given at Dublin, 2nd September, 1829."

And then Mr. Owens showed them that this approbation was signed by "Daniel Murray, D.D.," the late Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, and he showed them this added to it—"We concur with the above approbation," signed by 24 of the Irish Roman Catholic bishops. So Jem and Pat were both satisfied that this was the right book, and Pat was more easy in his mind; for after reading this he thought it could be no harm for him to look into it; and so he kept this book in his hand, and Mr. Owens handed the other to Jem.

"Now, where would you like to read?" said Mr. Owens.

"Oh, your reverence can choose better than we can," said Jem.

So Mr. Owens opened the Church of England Bible at the First Epistle of Timothy, chap. ii. and verse 5, and Jem read as follows—"For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus."

"Holy Kitty!" exclaimed Jem.

"Stop a minute, my friend," said the parson, laying his hand on Jem's arm; "who was Kitty?"

"Why, then, indeed, your reverence," said Jem, "I don't know, barrin' she might be one of the saints."

"And will you swear by you don't know who? Do you know what our Saviour says about swearing?" said the parson.

"I suppose 'thou shalt not take the name of God in vain,'" said Jem; "but what harm is it to swear by holy Kitty?"

"Is it not harm to do what Christ commands us not to do?" said Mr. Owens.

"Surely," said Jem, "there's no denying that."

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "listen to the words of Christ himself, in his own sermon on the Mount (Matthew v. 34), 'I say to you not to swear at all,' and in v. 37, 'Let your speech be yea, yea; no, no; and that which is over and above these is evil.' And the Apostle St. James, in his epistle, says (chapter 5, v. 12), 'But, above all things, my brethren, swear not; neither by heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath; but let your speech be yea, yea; no, no; that you fall not under judgment.' Now, I ask you, my friends," said the parson, "can it be safe for us to swear by any oath, when we have such directions from God about our talk?"

"Surely not, your reverence," said Jem.

"And if God has given us such directions, ought we not to keep them? and can we keep them without knowing them? Now, did you ever know this before, that Christ had given us orders not to swear by any oath?"

"I never heard it before," said Jem.

"You see, then," said Mr. Owens, "what need we

have to study God's Word, in order that we may know what God commands us to do, or not to do. If we do not know his Word, we may be continually doing the very things that make him angry. But come back to the verse you read, Jem; it seemed to strike you forcibly."

"Holy Virgin!" exclaimed Jem.

"Stop again, my friend," said the parson; "are you not doing again the very thing that your Saviour bid you not do?"

"I am, your reverence," said Jem; "but it's so hard for a man to quit, in a moment, what he was used to all his life."

"You see, then," said the parson, "what need we have to study Christ's words, and to learn them carefully, that we may keep them. That is the reason that we teach the Bible to our children, that they may learn to avoid habits that are so displeasing to God, and so hard to get rid of. The Jews were told to teach them to their children; and why not to Christian children? And St. Paul praised Timothy for knowing them from a child. And you see now what need there is that the Church should teach Christ's word carefully to people; for it is not once hearing them that will do: we must read and study them again and again, to learn to keep them. And this is why we teach the Bible so much."

"But, your reverence," said Pat, "I hear Protestants swear betimes; and how comes that, if they get such instruction?"

"And many," said Mr. Owens, "that heard our viour teach, and his Apostles too, were never the better, but the worse of what they heard. Very likely that some that heard that sermon on the Mount went on swearing; but that was no fault of the teaching. The Church ought to teach Christ's words, whether man will hear them and do them or not. But come back to our verse; what were you going to say of it, Jem?"

"I was going to say, your reverence," said Jem (and he didn't swear this time), "if them isn't the very words that made Johnny Connor, the sexton to the chapel, turn Protestant. Sure I heard him myself, when Father John taxed him in the chapel forenent the people with reading, and wanted to take his Bible, and Johnny wouldn't give it. 'And what do you find in it,' says Father John, 'that you won't give it up?' 'I find in it,' says Johnny, 'that there is one Mediator between God and men. I mind the words well. Now, Pat,' said Jem, turning sharp round on Pat as he spoke, 'look at your book, man, and see if the words is there; and then we will see which book set Johnny Connor astray.'"

"Read it again in your own book first," said the parson, "and then we will see the 'differ' exactly."

So Jem read again, "For there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

"Now, my friend, will you read?" said the parson to Pat. So Pat read, "For there is one God and one Mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

"Now," said the parson, "what Bible set Johnny Connor astray?"

"Well, that's plain, anyway," said Jem; "there's but one Mediator; and the one book is as good as the other for that."

"What would you like to have next?" said Mr. Owens. So both told him to choose, for they were at a loss.

"Can you say the commandments?" said Mr. Owens.

"Yes, your reverence," said both of them.

So Mr. Owens turned to Jem, "Say the first commandment;" so Jem said, "Thou shalt have no other gods but me." Then Mr. Owens turned to Pat, and said, "Say the second commandment." "Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain."

"Is there nothing else between the two?" said Mr. Owens.

"No, your reverence," said both Pat and Jem together.

"Were you never taught that something was left out?"

"No, your reverence," said they both. So Mr. Owens opened the two Bibles, and made them read what was left out in their catechisms; and Jem read the first out of the Protestant book—"Thou shalt not make to thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments." And then Pat read out of the Roman Catholic Bible—"Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or of those things that are in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not adore them nor serve them. I am the Lord thy God, mighty, jealous, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments."—Exodus xx. 4, 5, 6 (Douay Bible).

* This date, 1509, must be a misprint, for the Douay version of the Old Testament was published for the first time in the year 1609.

"I don't see 'images' in the Catholic Bible, your reverence," said Pat.

"And what can a graven thing mean but a graven image?" said Mr. Owens.

"Never mind that, your reverence," said Jem. "I see the word '*likeness*' in both books; and if we must not make a '*likeness*' of anything in heaven, how can we make an image of it?"

"Now, then," said Mr. Owens, "you see what God said in his commandments, and you never knew that before."

"Well, that beats all, your reverence," said Jem, "the two Bibles is like enough; and the Catholic Bible that we don't see, and the Catholic catechism that we do see and learn, is not like at all."

"And that's too," said Mr. Owens, "in the matter of the commandments that he spoke himself. And how shall we know how to serve God if we do not know his commandments?" And here Mr. Owens showed them in the Douay Bible, the words just before the commandments of God—"And the Lord spake these words." Now, if God spoke all these words in giving his commandments, should not we know them all when we learn the commandments?

And here, you see, we should not put our trust in any church or man to teach us God's commandments, but we should look in the Bible to see what God commanded. But it's getting late," said Mr. Owens; "maybe you would come in some other night?"

"Indeed, an we will," said Jem, "but I'd like to have the book at home."

"Which book?" said Mr. Owens. So then Pat and Jem began debating; for Pat wanted the Catholic book, for he was still afraid the Protestant book might set him astray; so at last they agreed that Jem should take the Protestant Bible, and Pat the Douay Bible, and read them together, verse about in the evenings, till they found all the "differ;" and so Jem asked the price of his book. "A shilling," said the parson; so Jem paid it, well pleased. And then Pat pulled out his shilling.

"Oh," said Mr. Owens, "this book is four and sixpence."

"Four and sixpence! your reverence," said Pat; "and sure Jem's is the purtiest book; for it has a real leather cover on it, and this is only paper; and Jem's is only a shilling."

"I can't help that," said Mr. Owens; "we can't get this book for less."

"I see now, your reverence," said Jem, "it's the Protestants that wants the poor to have the Bible anyway, when they make it cheap." And so the parson agreed to give Pat his book for two and sixpence, and to take it at sixpence a week; and when they were going out, Mr. Owens said—"I hope, boys, you don't think that I set you astray."

"And does your reverence not want us to leave the Catholic Church?" said Pat.

"If St. Peter or St. Paul was to preach to-morrow," said Mr. Owens, "would you listen to them? or if they wrote you a letter would you read it?"

"Surely, your reverence," said Pat, "I would."

"And would that make you leave the Catholic Church?" said Mr. Owens.

"It couldn't, your reverence," said Pat.

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "I give you the letters they wrote to you and to all. If I saw St. Peter or St. Paul, I would not ask them to leave the Catholic Church; and no more would I ask you: I want you to be such Catholics as St. Peter and St. Paul were—no more, and no less; and for that I give you their writings to read. Judge for yourselves, my friends (for you have common sense, like most Irishmen), whether they who give you St. Peter and St. Paul's writings, or they who keep them from you, are most in earnest in wanting you to be such Catholics as St. Paul and St. Peter were."

So they left Mr. Owens for that night; and if we hear of anything more, it won't be lost.

CONVERSIONS AND PERVERSIONS.

IN our opening address to our readers we remarked that publications such as this, devoted to the calm consideration of the points of religious difference amongst our countrymen, are particularly well suited to the times in which we live. Fifty or a hundred years ago such a paper would have had no chance of finding readers. The fashion then was to cry down all attempts to meddle with the religious belief of others. "Let every man," it was said, "go to heaven his own way, content himself to believe what his father or his teacher had taught him, and satisfied to let his neighbour believe in peace the creed in which he had been brought up." But a time has now come when this way of talking will no longer impose on any one. We know that, in the religious disputes which now prevail, both parties cannot be in the right; and since both parties profess to bring us a message from God, we cannot think it a matter of small consequence which is in the right, and which is in the wrong. No doubt, it is not pleasant to question the

truth of the doctrines which we have believed from childhood, and to ask ourselves, "Is it possible that we may have been mistaken in what we have so many years received as certain?" But, pleasant or not, the inquiry cannot but be profitable. If we are in the wrong, it may, perhaps, concern our eternal salvation to find out our mistake in time; and if we are in the right, it cannot but be a comfort and satisfaction to our minds to be able to give good convincing reasons for our belief.

As we began by saying, there has not been a time these hundred years at which men were better disposed than they are now in these countries, to see and act on their duty of examining for themselves whether what their parents and their clergy had taught them be true or not. Very many have thus, more or less, examined for themselves; and the result has been, that they have been satisfied of the correctness of what they have been taught, and have decided on abiding by their old religion. But there are a good many more with whom such an examination ends otherwise, and who, for love of what they think truth, are willing to give up all their old opinions, even though they lose thereby the friendship of those most dear to them. But the wonder is, that these conversions take place on both sides. Protestants have become Romanists, and Romanists have become Protestants. Now, we do not mean to dispute the sincerity of either party in their change. The spirit in which this journal is conducted does not allow us to impute unworthy motives, nor are we at all disposed to do so. At first this was done commonly enough by men who cared more for their party than for truth; and those who gained nothing by their change but to be cursed, and pelted, and hooted, to be turned off from their employments, and shut out from the shops where they had been used to deal, were said to have changed their religion only for the sake of the worldly advantages they gained by the change. Now, however, this cannot much longer be said; for the number of converts is now great enough to exhaust any funds which the most liberal imagination can suppose supplied for the purpose of proselytizing. At any rate, let others act as they will, we, in this journal, are determined not to seek for truth by abusing our opponents instead of arguing with them; for the sincerity of their motives we know they must give an account to God: all we are concerned with is, what reason each can give for his change of religion. It is plain enough that when a Protestant becomes a Romanist and a Romanist becomes a Protestant, one of the two must have changed for the worse. One of them must have given up truth, to take falsehood in its stead. It is important, then, that we should hear what reasons each can give, that we may know which is the convert and which is the pervert.

There are some who would settle this question in a very summary manner. They say the converts who have been made to Protestantism are, for the most part, ignorant men, who have not read books of controversy on the points disputed between the churches; those who have given up Protestantism are learned men, who have been able to study what doctrines were held by the Fathers and by the primitive church, and who, no doubt, have embraced the Romish faith because their reading has taught them that this had been held by the church from the beginning. "Ought we not, then, to attach more weight to the conversion of one such learned man than to the change of the religious opinions of a hundred uneducated peasants?" It is proverbial, however, that a man is likely to bring himself to shame who decides on a matter before he hears it; and so, in this case, we do not think it fair to come to a conclusion without hearing what each party has to say. We must not let our prejudices make us refuse to listen to the one if he has good reasons to offer, nor must we take for granted that the conclusions of him whom we think the more learned are right, unless it appears that it is his learning that has led him to these conclusions.

Of those English clergymen who were the first to go over from Oxford to Rome, Mr. Ward and Mr. Oakeley were two of the most prominent. While still professing to be members of the Church of England, both had written in defence of Roman Catholic doctrine so warmly that the one was deprived of his degrees by his university, and the other was censured by a formal decision of the ecclesiastical courts, and prohibited from performing any ministerial duties until he should retract his errors. Both, in consequence, abandoned the communion of the Church of England, at a time when several, who have since followed their example, were still professing themselves her faithful and devoted children. It is, then, no unfair choice to take Mr. Ward and Mr. Oakeley, the leaders of the movement, as samples for the rest, and to inquire in their case whether superior learning was the cause of the change in their religious opinions. Now, it is very remarkable that both these gentlemen take pains to declare their ignorance of the common controversial writings on both sides, and to profess, too, that it was not any search into the writings of the early Fathers which led to their change of creed. Mr. Ward says—"When the eyes of certain English churchmen were opened by God's grace, some twelve years ago, to discern the fearful precipice towards which religious opinion was hastening among us, they altogether eschewed the idle and religious child's play of

examining between rival doctrines by means of patristic and scholastic studies." And Mr. Oakeley says—"So long as the Church of England impressed my own conscience, in spite of her many anomalies, as an adequate object of loyalty and affection, I not only clung to her, but gave myself up to her without examining the question of her historical claims upon my acceptance. And so now, without knowing definitely how Rome makes out her pretensions from the history of past ages (a most interesting question, nevertheless, and one which I am delighted to think is so soon to receive elucidation), I bow myself before her, because she plainly corresponds with that type of the Catholic Church which is deeply and habitually impressed upon my whole moral and spiritual nature." In these and such like passages these writers treat the deciding of religious controversies, by learned historical investigations, as idle and ridiculous child's play; and they think it only necessary to inquire which religion is best adapted to satisfy their own spiritual wants. Now, it is plain, that when this line of argument is taken up, the opinion of the most refined and highly educated man is not worth more than that of the poorest and most illiterate. Christ said of his religion, that *the poor* had the Gospel preached unto them; and he, no doubt, intended his Gospel to satisfy the spiritual wants of the many as well as of the few. And, certainly, the multitude who, within the last few years, have joined the communion of the Church of England, would say that they have done so (amongst other reasons) because her doctrines are best qualified to satisfy their spiritual wants. They would tell us, that once they were ignorant, and that so long as they quietly submitted to the rules of their Church, their spiritual guides cared not to instruct them; but that now they are encouraged to read and love the written Word of God; that once they knew nothing of the real character of the Son of God; that they were taught to regard him as a harsh and stern judge, and that his place in their affections was occupied by other mediators, through whom, they supposed, they must appease him; but that, since they have read the Scriptures for themselves, they know that there is but one Mediator between God and man, and that none other can be more loving, more compassionate, more ready to sympathize with all their feelings, or better deserving of any love they can offer him in return; that once they thought little of sin; that they imagined a few words of confession, followed by the priest's absolution, washed out the old score, and left them at liberty to begin a new one; but that now they dread sin, since they have learned to know it as the abominable thing which God hates, as that which is sufficient, if unatoned for, to plunge the whole of the human race in misery, and which nothing less than the blood of a Divine Saviour will blot out; that once they committed to the grave with shuddering fearfulness the bodies of their departed friends, believing that, even the best of them, had gone to a place of torment, there to remain they knew not how long, and giving as much money as their scanty means would allow to hasten the release of those whom they loved from that state of misery; but that now, when they follow to the tomb one who has died in Christ, their sorrow is only for their own loss; but they dread no sufferings for the departed: they believe that he whom the blood of Christ has cleansed from *all* sin has no further any debt to pay, and they listen, with joyful confidence, to the consoling words of Scripture, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord: even so, saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labours." Now, when these men tell us that the doctrines which they have thus embraced are those best adapted to satisfy their spiritual wants, it is no answer to say, that these men are not learned; for this is a question with which learning has nothing to do. The argument is just as good in their mouths as when Mr. Oakeley and Mr. Ward tell us, that it suits *their* spiritual necessities best to listen to the voice of a church speaking with authority, and pronouncing dogmatically on every point of doctrine, and to be spared the trouble of searching out the truth for themselves.

But, in point of fact, the Irish converts to Protestantism are *more learned* than the English converts to Romanism; for they do not content themselves with the arguments just alluded to. They do not pronounce on the truth of a doctrine, from its fitness to satisfy the wants of their own minds, without an appeal to antiquity. If asked, why they reject any Romish doctrine? the first answer they would give is, because they find it does not agree with the teaching of the primitive Church. The doctrines of the primitive Church have been handed down to us in the writings of the apostles and evangelists; and an acquaintance with these is the most valuable learning that a Christian can possess. Such learning the Church of England desires should be possessed by the humblest of her members. She does not ask them to believe any doctrine on her word alone; nor does she wish to keep them in ignorance, in the hope that they will be thus more ready to listen to her teaching; but she wishes them to examine for themselves, whether what she teaches be not the very same which Peter, and John, and Paul taught. And when men say that they have so examined, and have

* We are glad to hear that the Douay Bible may now be procured at 2s. 6d., published by Simms and McIntyre, Belfast.—En.